



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

➤CONTRIBUTED: NOTES.◀

Qamhi.—In an article in the *HEBRAICA* for October, 1884, I wrote the name of the celebrated grammarian as Qamhi, not Qimhi, basing it upon three MSS. of the **מכלול**, in the *Bibliothèque Imperiale*, in which the name was vocalized **קמחי**, and referring (p. 82, note 2) to the discussion in the London *Athenæum*, of March 22d, 1884. In a "Notiz" in the *Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, for November, Dr. M. Steinschneider says that he has found the name **קמחי** in Arabic (vol. II. of the Catalogue of Oriental MSS. in the Bodleian Library, p. 568) in the Arabic form **אלקמחי**, and that this is vocalized by Uri and Pusey as *Alcamahi*. Dr. Steinschneider is, however, seemingly unconvinced. At all events, he continues to write the name "Kimchi."

CYRUS ADLER,
Johns Hopkins University.

On Genesis I., 1-3.—A friend has pointed out to me that, in the Note published in *HEBRAICA*, October, 1885, p. 49, I have made no reference to Wellhausen's theory, described in *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (1883) p. 411. In fact, the Note was in substance written before the star of this acute critic had risen upon the horizon. Wellhausen bluntly calls the Ewaldian view of the construction "verzweifelt;" it is certainly out of character with the rest of the narrative. The difficulty about the omission of the article in **בְּרֵאשִׁית** (if we choose to retain that punctuation) does not strike me as a very serious one. (Delitzsch, I observe, renders *ἐν ἀρχῇ* John I., 1, by **בְּרֵאשִׁית**). I have referred already to **מְרֵאשִׁית** in Isa. XLVI., 10. And if this be designated poetry, why is Gen. I. to be called prose? Doubtless in plain narrative style we should expect — **בְּ**, though rather **בְּרֵאשִׁית** than **בְּרֵאשִׁית** (as Dr. A. McCaul long ago observed): the latter indeed might have suggested wrongly that the creation mentioned in the verse was the first in a series of creative acts. Wellhausen's remark, so ingenious, so plausible, in *Geschichte Israels* (1878) I., 399, that the temporal sense of **רֵאשִׁית** is borrowed from Aramaic, has been justly criticized by Prof. Driver (*Journal of Philology*, XI., 232, note), who also maintains,—and he is probably right,—that **רֵ** in the temporal sense occurs as early as Hosea (IX., 10). The difference in form between the parallel passages in Wellhausen is very interesting; it shows how carefully he revised his work.

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE,
Oxford, England.

A Prayer in Hebrew.—It occurred to Mr. Benjamin Douglass, of Chicago, one of the Lecturers during the session of the Summer School, that it might stimulate some of the students to the more earnest study of the Holy Tongue if he should offer the usual opening prayer in Hebrew: and he accordingly thought out and spoke the prayer which follows. As a further incitement he has added the accents.

כָּרוֹךְ אֶתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא שֶׁמֶר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֲסֵד לְכָל-
 אֲהַבָּיָה הוֹדִינוּ לָךְ : אֶתָּה הוּא הָאֵב הַבֵּן וְרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ יְהוָה אֶחָד :
 קָדוֹשׁ י קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עוֹד יִמְלֹא כְבוֹדָךְ אֶת-כָּל-הָאָרֶץ :
 אֲנַחְנוּ חַטָּאִים נוֹלַדְנוּ וְגַם-חַטָּאִנוּ וְעוֹנֵינוּ הִרְשַׁעְנוּ וּמִרְדְּנוּ וּמִכַּף-הַגֹּל
 וְעַד-רֹאשׁ אֵין-מָתוֹם לָנוּ : אֲבָל הִשְׁמַחְתָּנוּ כִּי אֶהְבְּתָנוּ וַתִּשְׁלַח בְּנֶךָ יַחֲיִידָךְ
 וַיָּמָת בְּעַבְדֵינוּ : בְּדַבָּרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יֵשׁוּעַ הַמָּשִׁיחַ הָאָדוֹן לְתַלְמִידָיו
 נִתְפַּלֵּל : אֲבִינוּ אֲשֶׁר בְּשָׁמַיִם יְקָדֵשׁ שְׁמֶךָ : תָּבֵא מַלְכוּתָךְ יְהִי רְצוֹנָךְ
 כְּאֲשֶׁר בְּשָׁמַיִם כֵּן גַּם בָּאָרֶץ : לֶחֶם חֲקֵנוּ תֵן לָנוּ הַיּוֹם : וּסְלַח לָנוּ אֶת-
 חַבְתֵינוּ כְּאֲשֶׁר אֲנַחְנוּ סֹלְחִים לְכָל-בְּעָלֵי חֻבֵינוּ : וְאֵל תְּבִיאֵנוּ לְמִסָּה כִּי
 אִם-הִצִּילָנוּ מִן-הָרָע כִּי לָךְ הַמַּמְלָכָה וְהַגְבוּרָה וְהַתְפָּאֶרֶת עוֹלָמִי עַלְמִים
 אָמֵן :

A Note on the Relative (אֲשֶׁר).—It might easily be inferred from a note by Professor Sayce, in *HEBRAICA*, October, 1885, that to that distinguished author must be referred the suggestion that אֲשֶׁר originally meant "place," corresponding to the Semitic words which contain this meaning. A few quotations will correct this impression :—

Says Professor Sayce in his *Assyrian Grammar for Comparative Purposes* (1872), "Sa must not be connected with אֲשֶׁר (= אַתָּר, ašaru, like So place, which, in Chinese) while the Phœnician אִש (y s) is probably אִישׁ" (pp. 45, 46).

Mühlau did not make his similar comparison for the first time in 1878, when the 8th ed. of Gesenius's *Lexicon* appeared, but, at that time, simply added "Ass. ašar" (which, however, Norris had connected with אַתָּר in his *Assyrian Dict.*, published in 1868) to the number of related words which he had named twelve years before. He had said, in his edition of Böttcher (1866), "Anders verhält es sich, wenn man, was mir das Wahrscheinlichste, אֲשֶׁר mit Chald. אַתָּר, Syr. اَثَرٌ Ort, Arab. اَثَرٌ vestigium, Spur combinirt. אֲשֶׁר wäre dann ein ursprüngliches Nomen im allgemeinen Sinne von Ort, vgl. unser vulgäres relatives wo;" and he does not claim to be the first to say so.

Indeed Tsepregi had furnished a pretty strong hint in the same direction. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus* (1835) says : "Tsepregi in diss. Lugd. p. 171, relationis notionem ducit a signo et vestigio, coll. اَثَرٌ et اَثَرٌ vestigium, signum, hinc اَثَرٌ علی post." (p. 165).

Whether the last was the earliest suggestion which has been published, the present writer cannot say. Nor was it suited to his purpose, in *HEBRAICA*, April, 1885, to use any of the passages here quoted. It seemed best to select Hommel as the representative of an opposing view, because the latter had said more than any one known to him in argument for that view, and had attempted